DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 472 134 SP 041 310

AUTHOR	Cooper, Mary Gendernalik
TITLE	Central Savannah River Area P-16 Professional Development School Network: A Reflective Summary of Four Years of Collaboration.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	38p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Learning Communities

ABSTRACT

This article traces the development of the Central Savannah River Area P-16 Professional Development School Network Initiative (PDSNI), which began in 1998 as a collaboration between the Department of Teacher Development at Augusta State University, Georgia, and four adjacent school systems. The collaboration's mission was to cultivate a network of energetic learning communities characterized by a shared commitment to educational excellence (in professional practice and student achievement) across institutional boundaries. The article focuses on the PDSNI's goals, scope and structures, role changes, curricular revisions, evaluation components, resources, and complementary initiatives. By the conclusion of the fourth full year of work, the PDSNI had matured as a robust, multi-faceted exemplar of teacher education transformation. The commitment of the chair and faculty in the Department of Teacher Development to cultivating the PDSN as the centerpiece of its program improvement efforts was pivotal to its progress and effectiveness. By initially focusing on improving teacher education, college faculty and diverse school teachers and administrators found common ground. Commitment of school teachers and administrators was also key to success. Leadership in the PDSNI focused on cultivating a shared vision and shared responsibility for collaboration. (Contains 24 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 472 134

Central Savannah River Area P-16 Professional Development School Network: A Reflective Summary of Four Years of Collaboration

Mary Gendernalik Cooper

2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ō This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Gendernalik Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

SP041310

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Central Savannah River Area P-16 Professional Development School Network: A Reflective Summary of Four Years of Collaboration

Over the past sixteen years the professional development school movement has been a central feature of initiatives to reform and transform educator preparation, professionalize teaching, integrate research, theory and practice, and to improve the quality of P-12 student learning and achievement. During this period, the professional development school movement has expanded well beyond the research institutions that made up the Holmes Group (now Holmes Partnership) and the original National Network for Education Renewal, two groups at the forefront of the PDS movement. Since the mid-1990s when a number of state education agencies and higher education regulatory/administrative units promulgated guidelines, regulations and mandates to encourage school-university partnerships, institutions of varied size, environment and mission have endeavored to incorporate partner schools in their educator preparation programs. The burgeoning professional literature on professional development schools affirms two pervasive principles. Expectations for professional development schools as central vehicles of education and educator preparation reform are ambitious, complex and comprehensive. The genuine collaboration between school systems and universities that is essential to cultivating sustainable and effective professional development schools requires considerable commitment, stewardship, time, and energy. Recognizing how varied institutions have addressed these principles in their efforts to enact professional development schools can inform both the work and the literature.

Regional public universities (Carnegie Masters I and II classifications) make up the majority of educator preparation units in the country and account for the largest portion of educator preparation candidates. Many of them began or have long histories as

educator preparation institutions. Their missions continue to emphasize teaching but increasingly hold expectations for faculty involvement in scholarship as well as service. This paper describes the experience of one regional public university as it collaboratively developed with four adjacent school systems a network of professional developments schools which became the centerpiece of its educator preparation reform efforts.

The Central Savannah River Area (CSRA) P-16 Professional Development School Network Initiative (PDSNI) began in 1998 as a collaboration between the Department of Teacher Development at Augusta State University, a member institution of the University System of Georgia, and four adjacent school systems. The collaborative's mission was to cultivate a network of energetic learning communities characterized by a shared commitment to educational excellence—in professional practice and student achievement—across institutional boundaries. During its first four years of enactment, 1998-2002, the PDSNI included 28 schools from the four school systems. As it began its fifth year of operation in fall 2002, the PDSNI has expanded to include 37 schools from five contiguous school systems in the Central Savannah River Area of Georgia. Over two hundred teachers and almost three hundred educator preparation candidates participate in the PDSNI each year.

This article traces the evolutionary development of the PDSNI, elaborating on its goals, scope and structures, role changes, curricular revisions, evaluation components, resources, and complementary initiatives. It concludes with a summary of insights and lessons. The university, school systems and schools through which the PDSNI developed are as typical and traditional as most regional public institutions that prepare and hire teachers. So, as a case of transformation, its work and lessons may resonate more

broadly and compellingly to the vast majority of educator preparation units, their universities and P-12 partners.

Impetus for PDSNI:

The Department of Teacher Development was created in 1996 with responsibility for all teacher certification programs in the university except special education and physical education. At that time elementary and middle grades certification programs had the status of baccalaureate degree majors; certification requirements were treated as academic minors for students majoring in secondary fields (English, Math, Science, Social Studies). Post-baccalaureate students could pursue certification by completing the requisite professional studies coursework and field experiences. Field experience placements were handled by a staff person who faxed lists of student names to principals requesting placements—two hours per week, per course, over the ten-week quarter. Students often completed their "lab" requirements for different courses at different schools, frequently accumulating as many hours on the road traveling from school to school as they did in the classrooms. This placement process obviated any systematic coordination between the campus and field components of courses and programs.

The impetus for the PDSNI was three-fold. First, as part of the university's planning for converting from a ten week quarter to a fifteen week semester academic calendar the Department of Teacher Development undertook a thorough-going evaluation of its teacher certification programs. Course requirements within the programs had grown to exceed by twenty-quarter hours those required by the university for earning a baccalaureate degree; semester conversion guidelines required that baccalaureate programs not exceed 120 semester hours. The faculty sought to prune course

requirements within a deliberate pursuit of greater coherence in each program, stronger emphasis on the intellectual engagement of candidates (particularly critical analysis, synthesizing, complex problem solving and reflection), fuller integration of the academic and field experience components of the programs, and more systematic collaboration with P-12 colleagues. Second, changes in unit accreditation (NCATE) and program approval standards (Georgia's Professional Standards Commission) as well as the creation of a set of guidelines and principles for educator preparation by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (USG) for all of its member institutions necessitated both extensive curriculum revisions and genuine collaboration among faculty in teacher education, arts and sciences, and P-12 settings. The third impetus was the statewide P-16 initiative, promulgated by the governor and energetically led by the chancellor of the University System, to improve articulation and achievement across the spectrum of education institutions. The structure of the P-16 initiative included a statewide Council and sixteen regional councils, each of which centered at a USG campus. The CSRA P-16 Council provided a forum for school systems, the university and other educationally focused organizations and agencies to address local educational articulation and achievement issues.

In September 1997 the chair of the Department of Teacher Development was appointed coordinator of the CSRA P-16 Council, and was appointed to the Board of Regents Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Teacher Preparation. This convergence of responsibilities facilitated the germination of what has become the CSRA P-16 PDSNI.

Goals

The following goals guide the work of the PDSNI:

1. to create a sustainable network of schools through which the schools, as full collaborating partners with the university, prepare new teachers;
2. to support teaching practices that promote and assist all students (P-16) achieving to high standards;
3. to sustain teaching excellence through experienced teachers' and university faculty members' continued professional development.
4. to contribute to the professional knowledge-base of teaching by undertaking systematic inquiry into issues and challenges related to professional teaching practice and student achievement.

From its inception the development of the PDSNI has been framed by the four functions of Professional Development Schools, as articulated in the NCATE (Draft) Standards (1997, 2001): educator preparation; student learning & achievement; professional development; communities of inquiry to improve teaching and learning.

In addition to the NCATE PDS Standards we have utilized other national professional standards in framing various performance and program outcome expectations. The INTASC standards, for example, have been used in defining course and program outcomes for certification candidates. Rubrics based on these standards define varied levels of performance proficiency and expectations for performance from students in the first semester of the program through the induction period of the first two years of teaching. Expectations for instructional performance of P-12 master teachers and university coordinators are grounded in the five core propositions of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. Expectations for P-12 student learning and achievement are framed within the Georgia Quality Core Curriculum standards and

appropriate national content standards. Linking the PDSNI work to these public and widely acknowledged standards facilitates articulation of goals and actions across functions, grade levels, and subject areas. The linkages further accommodate alignment of goals with practices and both performance and outcome assessments, without precluding appropriate and often creative adaptations and tailoring.

All of these standards have been and continue to be the subject of extensive critical review and analysis within various professional and political arenas. PDSNI participants are encouraged to access this discourse and to join it. This strategy stimulates our community of inquiry and dissuades participants from viewing or treating standards as dogma. This process of critically questioning, challenging and examining the standards as they are enacted in the PDSNI enriches the reflective dimension of the collaboration. Through this reflective questioning process a deeper, more nuanced understanding of these standards in relation to the PDSNI purposes and work is being cultivated. Participants attend more critically to what standards look like in the highly complex reality of practice; how they resonate with other institutional purposes and standards; how well or poorly they serve to inform assessment and accountability expectations and practices. This process substantively deepens, enriches, and enlivens the collaboration across school and university boundaries.

Scope & Structures

From its inception the PDSNI was envisioned to wholly replace the extent structures, procedures, roles, and programmatic features of the educator preparation programs in the Department of Teacher Development. In this sense the PDSNI was not an incremental project. It never co-existed with the previous traditional model. Even as

it has emerged and evolved since first implementation in fall 1998, it began as a comprehensive rather than piecemeal reform initiative. Participants never viewed it as an isolated or experimental "project" in which a select few would participate until the funding ran out. In this sense the PDSNI was conceptualized even initially as a transformational rather than tinkering undertaking.

The term structure suggests entities, physical or organizational, with well defined boundaries, clearly delineated elements and points of connectivity or passage ways that link the elements to each other (often in restrictive, unidirectional patterns) and the structure as a whole to its environment. In organizational as well as physical structures the elements convey inclusion and the passage ways convey the rules for element interaction. As is evident in the professional literature on Professional Development School and Partner School initiatives considerable time, energy and resources are invested in structuring these entities. The often-sighted rationale for this strategy includes claims that the structure will ensure continuity and longevity even if individual participants happen to leave; and that the structure can actually facilitate the work of the collaborative. On the first point of the rationale, experiences suggest that individuals are ás likely to leave a collaborative venture when it is preoccupied with structure building at the expense of the collaborative work for which the structure is being built. Regarding the second point of the rationale, it is important to keep in mind the increasing emphasis in education reform literature, particularly that which considers the role of structures in substantive reform, on the cultural features and contexts of education entities and their influence on sustainable or resilient reform. This literature suggests that engagement in the collaborative work and attending to cultural and contextual features of the existing

entities should precede and inform the re-design of structures, a variation on the principle of form following function. Structuring the PDSNI has been deliberately minimalist and responsive to the work as it evolves.

Between each of the participating school systems and the university formal agreements for placement of educator preparation candidates in the schools were already in place. It was agreed early in the collaborative work that these contracts were sufficient and did not need revision. Since the PDSNI began as a collaborative project of the CSRA P-16 Council the institutional delegates to the council became the PDSNI institutional liaisons. The chair of the Department of Teacher Development also served as the CSRA P-16 Council coordinator and authored the grant proposal for initiating the PDSNI. She became the director of PDSNI. The CSRA P-16 Council members jointly created the application and screening process through which the initial 28 PDSs were selected. Grant funding supported three full-day workshops for teams from these schools to come together to create a working network and to define various roles and responsibilities for both university and school-based participants. The working network that emerged in those workshops has been maintained over four years of PDSNI implementation. Each PDS has an internally selected Building Coordinator (in most instances a master teacher) who serves as the chief communication link between the PDS and the Department of Teacher Development in the university. The Building Coordinator is pivotal to PDS enactment. Each faculty member in the Department of Teacher Development serves as university coordinator to three or four PDSs. They are the Building Coordinator's communication counter-part. The PDSs are clustered in grade-alike groups and each university coordinator works only with PDSs within one of the

clusters (elementary, middle, secondary). There are two full-day meetings of all Building Coordinators and University Coordinators twice each semester at the university. The school system liaisons also participate in these meetings; as do faculty members from programs and departments outside of Teacher Development but who participate in educator preparation. PDS building administrators are invited to all of the meetings. Most only attend the meeting at which the annual PDS evaluation is reported. As much as anything this pattern is indicative of the principals' confidence in, and reliance on their individual building coordinators. The Network meetings plan the professional development agenda for the academic year; review various kinds of performance, perceptual, and program evaluation data; plan for changes in the educator preparation programs; review and confirm schedules and placements of educator preparation students; review applicants for master teacher designation; report on their own PDSs review and renewal, and inquiry projects. These meetings also provide the opportunity to review developments within the school systems, the university and university system, the state and nationally that may be pertinent to PDSNI work. These formal meetings are complemented by numerous informal grade-alike cluster meetings, telephone and e-mail communications as well as extensive work with teachers and administrators in each PDS. Similarly the PDSNI director and the school system liaisons regularly communicate and meet through the schedule of CSRA P-16 Council meetings, telephone and e-mail, as well as through collaborative work on the complementary initiatives that have spun off the PDSNI.

During the first three years of the PDSNI the director periodically scheduled forums for university faculty to inform them of PDSNI activities, and to hear their

concerns, issues and questions. Curriculum and program revisions had contributed to increased participation by arts and sciences faculty in educator preparation and the forum was a venue for communication particularly regarding field components of the programs. The forums supplemented the Network meetings and accommodated varied teaching schedules.

Two scheduling elements constituted important dimensions of the PDSNI structure, the scheduling of classes and field experiences. Within the Department of Teacher Development, all initial certification courses were scheduled on Tuesday and Thursday. This accommodated students, particularly non-traditional adult students with concentrated hours and dependability; it helped faculty plan blocks of time for school-based work and scholarship; it ensured that university coordinators could attend all of the Network meetings, these were always scheduled on Wednesday. To the extent this schedule challenged pertinent arts and sciences offerings, chairs in those departments graciously endeavored to work around this structure. The fact that it was dependable semester to semester helped in this regard. Each of the professional studies courses required considerable field experience or "lab" hours that were integral to the course (hours ranged from 33—45 clock hours per course). The university-wide conversion to a fifteen week semester and the introduction of the Tuesday/Thursday course block schedule accommodated the introduction of dedicated lab weeks in the middle of the semester. During the first two years of PDSNI each semester was structured with the first eight weeks in on-campus instruction, five weeks of lab in the PDSs during which time classes on campus were suspended, then the final two weeks of the semester in on-campus instruction. Following a significant program change, it was decided that

candidates needed a week early in the semester to familiarize themselves with the classes, curriculum and settings. The revised schedule has six weeks of on-campus instruction, one week of lab orientation, two weeks back on campus, four weeks of lab, two weeks on campus. This schedule affords faculty and candidates dedicated time in the PDSs; it affirms to candidates the importance of the field experience components and their integral place in the curriculum. It also eliminated the need or desire for trying to schedule classes in the schools, which was increasingly a logistical challenge.

The formal teacher education policy structure within the university incorporates department and college level bodies and a university Teacher Education Council (TEC). Since the PDSNI has been fully integrated into the programs of the department faculty from the department who participate in college and TEC deliberations do so with PDSNI issues in mind. Until spring of 2002 the TEC had one P-12 teacher and one P-12 administrator as voting members. Both of these individuals have always been from PDSs. In spring 2002 the Council determined to change its bi-laws and add five P-12 voting members, a teacher and administrator from each grade-alike cluster (P-5, middle and secondary levels) and a special education teacher or administrator. The bi-law change did not require that these individuals represent active PDSs, (the college of education dean appoints these members, usually with input from the department); tactically this would have been a PDS affirmation. To the extent that these representatives do come from the PDSNI, it will have a stronger voice in university educator preparation policy.

The depth and breadth of commitment to PDSNI by the school systems and schools has reached a level that might well warrant considered attention to formalizing

structures and specific agreements that more explicitly codify the participation of the PDSNI in educator preparation policy, procedure, and decision making at the university and in professional development, faculty reward, and school achievement agendas within the school systems. The extent to which this process is based on continuing mutual trust and respect is pivotal to its eventual success.

Role Changes

Since 1998 considerable role maturation and elaboration, grounded in the roles of Building Coordinator, University Coordinator, and Master Teacher that were inaugurated at the beginning of the initiative, have occurred. The Building Coordinator role was created at the beginning of the PDSNI. It was agreed in the planning workshops that each PDS needed an individual (preferably a master teacher) to serve as the internal coordinator of PDS related work and as the principle communications link to a university counterpart. The building coordinator tasks have evolved to include working with the principal to identify teachers to whom university students could be assigned, cultivating faculty interest in and establishing eligibility for master teacher designation, bringing information about the school to the process of coordinating with the university the number and types of placements to be made in the school, coordinating the planning of seminars for apprentices, orienting the university students to the school, supporting and assisting teachers when problems related to educator candidates arose, collaborating with other building coordinators in formulating the PDS professional development agenda and in the selection and review of master teachers.

The university coordinator role has evolved in tandem with the building coordinator role. The university coordinators are all tenure track faculty whose primary

responsibilities are in the initial certification programs. This role is pivotal to realizing curricular coherence and full integration of the field experience component of courses and programs. Just as with the building coordinator the university coordinator role has similarly matured. Communication links with PDS Building Coordinators and master teachers have deepened and widened. Since the inception of the PDSNI university coordinators and building coordinators have assumed primary responsibility for all placements of educator preparation students in the early childhood, middle grades and secondary subjects certification programs. Because these faculty know the students well and the building coordinators know their colleagues and commitments this process has all but eliminated poor matches, or inappropriate assignments. When issues do arise within this context, they are quickly evident and resolved to mutual satisfaction. Student complaints about field experience placements have disappeared. Assignments are made well in advance; adjustments and changes are minimally disruptive or traumatic. There is resounding consensus among all PDSNI participants regarding the effectiveness and wisdom of this process.

The complementarity of the university and building coordinator roles manifests itself in an increasing number and variety of mutually supportive collaborative activities. Faculty regularly seek building coordinator and master teacher input into course and program change ideas. In turn they are regularly sought out by their PDSs for assistance and consultation in school-based initiatives. Joint teaching and scholarly projects that resonate to the PDSNI are increasingly evident as well.

The master teacher role substantively recasts the traditional "cooperating teacher". In traditional models the cooperating teachers are the gracious but deferential

hosts, welcoming student teachers into their classrooms, accommodating university stipulated requirements and providing feedback to the university supervisor on the student teachers' performance and professional qualities. The central tenets of this role's redefinition were that the teachers with whom educator preparation candidates completed their fifteen week "apprentice" semester should demonstrate the qualities of master teacher as defined by the NBPTS in their own teaching; and that they should be entrusted, as true collaborating partners, with the responsibility for serving as primary evaluators of the apprentices' performances and proficiencies. Master teachers are expected to demonstrate currency in their subject areas, a diverse and rich teaching repertoire that supported all students' achievement, the ability and dispositions to serve as coach, mentor and assessor of the educator preparation candidate, using their own reflective practice as the platform for this multi-faceted role. The process for selected master teachers simultaneously became more structured, public and systematic. Building coordinators and the initial cadre of master teachers were the primary architects of this selection and review process. The process now includes a written application that incorporates a pedagogical philosophy and beliefs-in-practice essay, administrator and peer recommendations, interviews and classroom observations. The master teachers have become increasingly comfortable and confident in this role, and have optimized its contributions to their professional development. Master teachers report enriching their own professional knowledge and repertoires to effectively and consistently model best practices and to appropriately guide and evaluate educator preparation students' performances. Master teachers and building coordinators have participated as full partners with the university faculty in designing a number of PDSNI related initiatives—a

Problem Based Learning project, the Showcase of Best Practices, the Middle Grades Summer STEP Academy, the Impacting Student Learning project and the beginning teachers induction program.

With the advent of PDSNI and related curriculum revisions the advising role of the university faculty members' has deepened and matured. In the early childhood and middle grades programs, faculty members assume advising responsibilities for cohorts of students, beginning at the time of admission to the program and continuing with the same students through program completion. This arrangement facilitates opportunities for effectively introducing students to the program, the PDS structure and placement rotations, to expectations for performance in classes and field experiences, to the portfolio through which students will document both progress and achievement in relation to the INTASC standards and the Impacting Student Learning components. This advisory role enhancement reflects faculty commitment to program excellence and documentation of program effectiveness in educator preparation, through high quality advisement.

The restructuring of the field experience component that more explicitly embeds it in courses and the semester has engendered a co-mingling of the university faculty and PDS lab/master teachers' traditionally distinct instructional roles. As the PDSNI matures expanded opportunities for such role sharing are evident. These opportunities occur naturally within the routine rhythms of the PDSs reducing the feel of artificiality that often attends "demonstration lessons" or "guest speaker" events. The introduction of the Impacting Student Learning component into designated courses of each program, has

heightened attention to the learning achievement of the P-12 student by university faculty and educator preparation students as well as the PDS teachers and administrators.

In the past year, the role of the lab teacher, to whom pre-service educator preparation students may be assigned for course-related field experiences, became the focus of considerable attention by building and university coordinators. As revisions in the educator preparation programs have increasingly focused on assessing candidate performance as it relates to helping youngsters achieve academically, the pivotal nature of the lab teacher's role has been heightened. The building coordinators recommended that expectations and support for the lab teacher role figure prominently in each year's PDSNI professional development plan. They also decided that the PDSNI professional development agenda incorporate opportunities for cultivating in lab teachers the professional practice and dispositional qualities required for master teacher designation.

Curriculum Revisions

Augusta State University is a member institution of the University System of Georgia. As such it participated, as did all system institutions, in semester conversion and in bringing its programs and offerings into compliance with system guidelines for the conversion. Among these guidelines was the requirement that baccalaureate programs be limited to 120 semester hours. One of the challenges to programs that had grown to exceed the 180 quarter hour minimum (which the educator preparation programs did) was to scale back requirements to come into compliance with the semester hour guideline. The University System also requires its member institutions that offer educator preparation programs to maintain NCATE accreditation, to be in compliance with Georgia Professional Standards Commission program requirements, and the system's

internal principles and guidelines. These factors shaped the external context of the curriculum revision process. Internally faculty sought to fashion curriculum revisions that emphasized coherence—pieces fitting together and making sense as a whole without reducing preparation to mere training—within each program, that balanced academic study of subject matter, developmental and content pedagogy, that integrated field and academic components of the program, and that developed and utilized technology skills. Along with the rest of the College of Education the department adopted the theme of "Understanding for Teaching, Teaching for Understanding", it then set about elaborating the theme and crafting curriculum to enact it. As a whole the department faculty undertook a joint examination of the "Teaching for Understanding" literature generated at the Harvard University Project Zero. This process afforded the opportunity to inquire together how distinct elements of program curriculum might manifest the tenets of "teaching for understanding" and simultaneously cultivating candidates' recognition that this constitutes the scaffolding of "understanding for teaching".

Faculty also examined and incorporated the content and content pedagogy standards of national professional societies (NCTM, NSTA, NCSS, NTEA) and professional organizations whose focus is learner development and appropriate pedagogy (NAEYC, AECEI, NMSA). This critical review of standards and principles related to educator proficiencies informed the curriculum revisions in the graduate as well as initial certification programs that are offered through the Department of Teacher Development. A further design principle that emerged from the department's deliberations was a commitment to explicitly tailor the curriculum of the initial certification programs to the grade level ranges each targeted. This eventuated in the elimination of "generic"

methods courses. The abiding premise of this design decision was that initial certification candidates have the least amount of background knowledge or experience to be able to appropriately adapt non-content or non-developmental specific pedagogy. Each program's curriculum is designed to assist candidates in developing their professional thinking and action around the relationships between content and learner characteristics. Simultaneously, the department adapted the ten INTASC standards to each initial certification program; using these standards in the articulation of course objectives, common performance assessment rubrics, and in framing the electronic portfolios through which educator preparation candidates would demonstrate evidence of progress, proficiency, and achievement.

In its efforts to achieve greater intra-program coherence faculty, including those from arts and sciences, teacher development, and the PDSs, worked tirelessly to increase and enrich the content component of the early childhood and middle grades programs, and to thoroughly integrate the field experience component of all programs. With respect to both of these efforts the revised principles for educator preparation enacted by the University System Board of Regents figured prominently, and in retrospect represent an instance of external mandates serving to enrich program content. Table I below illustrates the credit hour distributions of the educator preparation programs following the curriculum revision. Early childhood (P-5) candidates complete the equivalent of two concentrations (12—15 upper division semester hours), one in mathematics and one in reading, and six hours of content pedagogy in science and in social studies. Middle grades candidates complete content minors in two subject areas and a content reading diagnosis-remediation course. Both programs as well as the secondary certification

program continue to include developmental pedagogy, technology and special education components.

Table I
Distribution of Semester Hours in Educator Preparation Programs

Program	General Core Arts & Sciences	Major Specific Core A&S/Pedagogy	Upper Division Content	Upper Division Content Pedagogy	Upper Division Developmental Pedagogy
Early Childhood P-5	42	9/9	Two 12-15sh concentrations (Math & Reading)	12 6 each in science and social studies	6
Middle Grades 4-8	42	9/9	Two 12sh concentrations (Math, English, Social Studies, Science)	9 including reading diagnosis-remediation	12
Secondary 7-12	42	9/9	30 sh single subject major	6	6

All of the content pedagogy and developmental pedagogy courses incorporated PDS-based field experience or lab requirements, ranging from 30 to 45 clock hours. The culminating Apprenticeship semester in each program accounted for 450 to 600 clock hours. Each program met the USG Regents' requirement of the equivalent of one academic year, minimally 900 clock hours, of field experience. In its efforts to fully integrate the field experience requirements into each course and convey to candidates the importance of this component in their preparation the department faculty determined that students could not successfully complete courses if they did not receive passing evaluations on their field experience requirements and performance assessments. Each course syllabus reflected this commitment, albeit in appropriately varied ways, through the weighting scheme employed by the faculty member for graded assignments and tasks.

In addition to the expectation that both the content and field experience components of educator preparation programs be enhanced, the USG Regents' guidelines required its constituent members provide evidence that programs could affirm that their

candidates could effectively impact the learning and achievement of all the P-12 students with whom they worked. Within the PDSNI faculty worked to design Impacting Student Learning (ISL) components for each program. The design principles included developing a common set of elements, a common rubric for assessing performances, commitment to including at least one required ISL in each semester of work in the program, and commitment to ISL components for each subject area and major learner variation within a program. The latter point addressed the multiple subject nature of the Early Childhood program and the widely varied developmental characteristics in both the Early Childhood and Secondary programs. The ISL planning group included over twenty PDSNI faculty members (from arts and sciences, education and P-12 faculty) and three educator preparation candidates. The group worked together over an 18-month period to design the ISL framework and instruments. It created a website that organized exemplars by subject area, grade-level targets, and types of learning. The latter including: factual knowledge, concepts, generalizations/patterns/theories, skills, dispositions. The intent of the website was to serve as a resource bank into which exemplars from faculty and candidates could be deposited, and from which individuals could find exemplars as they crafted new ones.

As a curriculum revision the introduction of the ISL component has eventuated in a significant shift in candidates perspective; a shift noted simultaneously by candidates, course and field-based faculty. Essentially the ISL has shifted candidates' attention and focus away from themselves and toward the students with whom they are working and the impact the lessons are having on the students' learning and achievement. In all facets of instruction from selecting content through planning and sequencing activities,

selecting materials, developing and evaluating outcome appropriate assessments, candidates report their thinking is focused on helping students learn and demonstrating what has been learned and how well. Candidates no longer view their work primarily in terms of impressing either their professors or lab teachers.

The collaborative process employed to design and pilot the ISL was more than a significant curriculum revision. It was a major and powerful professional development activity for all involved. Over the period of development participants examined and explored issues related to organizing content for different types of learning, developmentally appropriate pedagogy, the linkage between these two, designing assessments for complex learning outcomes or those which do not accommodate readily to standard assessment strategies, such as dispositions. Participants had the opportunity to share with each other the challenges they faced in crafting ISL exemplars. Their struggles and those of the three candidates who participated in crafting, implementing and reporting ISL efforts provided collegial bridges across subject area, grade level and institutional affiliations. The development of the ISL illustrates the distinct opportunity PDSNI provided as a context for shared curriculum revision through genuine collaboration.

Table II summarizes the ISL Elements and Table III summarizes their configurations within each program.

Table II:
Impacting Student Learning Elements

Student Profiles:

- Developmental characteristics
- Background and experience
- School, classroom, community contexts
- Learning styles, abilities, needs
- Interviews of students, teachers, others

Assessment of Student Learning:

- Tools
- Processes
- Pre & post
- Formative & summative
- Authentic
- Connections to standards

Standards for Students--Learning:
(QCCs, National Content Standards, Stanford 9)

- Content: Understanding
- Type of learning task: knowledge, concept, skill, application, theory, disposition
- Thinking processes
- Outcomes, goals and objectives

Evaluation of Student Learning:

- Artifacts
- Analysis
- Explanation

Standards for Teachers--Pedagogy:
(INTASC/NBPTS)

- Developmentally appropriate
- Multiple paths to learning/diversity
- Cognitively/actively engaging
- Performance-based assessments

Reflection on & Refinement of Teaching & Learning:

- Continual reflection & refinement during teaching
- Final reflection & analysis

Both Include: Implications for further learning;
Refinements/revisions needed;
Action plan/next steps

Table III
IMPACTING STUDENT LEARNING (ISL) COMPONENTS

Level of Focus → / Certification Program ↓	Individual/ Tutorial	Whole Class Instruction 4-7 Student Focus	Whole Class Instruction Whole Class Focus	Varied Levels of Focus Multiple Examples
Early Childhood Program (P-5)	**Semester I**: Math content focus, 1-3 students, 3 weeks	**Semester II**: Science content focus, 4-7 students' performance assessed, 2-4 week unit	**Semester III**: Social Studies, whole class, 3-4 week unit; & Reading diagnosis-remediation, 2-3 students, 4 weeks	**Semester IV**: Candidate completes multiple units across varied subject areas, fully integrated into classroom curriculum, jointly determined with master teacher
Middle Grades Program (4-8)	**Semester I**: Content concentration focus (each candidate pursues 2 content concentrations: Math, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts), assessment focus is on learning processes, four weeks	**Semester II**: Content concentration focus, whole class performance assessed and Reading diagnosis-remediation tutoring of one student, four weeks	**Semester III**: Interdisciplinary focus, whole class performance assessed, five weeks	**Semester IV**: Candidate completes multiple units across content concentration areas, fully integrated into classroom curriculum, jointly determined with master teacher
Secondary Programs in single subject majors (7-12)	**Semester I**: Precedes formal entry to program	**Semester II**: Certification content field, 4-7 students' performance assessed across multiple classes, 3-4 weeks	**Semester III**: Certification content field, whole class performance assessed, five weeks	**Semester IV**: Candidate completes multiple units within certification content field, fully integrated into classroom curriculum, jointly determined with master teacher

PDSNI Evaluation

Just as the purposes and standards for developing the PDSNI have been grounded in the NCATE Draft PDS Standards, the NCATE Unit Accreditation Standards, various national professional societies' program standards, and the University System of Georgia Regents' Principles & Guidelines for Educator Preparation so has the PDSNI evaluation

framework. Since 1998 the framework has become increasingly comprehensive and includes multiple assessment strategies related to performance, processes, and program. The performance category includes assessments used in relation to educator evaluation candidates, P-12 students, and university and P-12 faculty as they participate in the educator preparation programs. The process category relates to the enactment of collaboration based on the NCATE PDS Standards. The program category relates to the educator preparation programs. Table IV summarizes the assessment elements of the framework in relation to each of these categories.

Table IV
PDSNI Comprehensive Assessment Framework

Assessment Element	Performance\Frequency	Process\Frequency	Program\Frequency
Course Performance Assessment	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Lab Assessment	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Professional Qualities	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
ISL	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Intervention	C 2 \As Needed	2 \Annually	
Candidate Portfolio	C 1 \Semester		2 \Annually
Apprentice Assessment	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Course Evaluation	F 2 \Semester		
Tenure & Promotion	F 1 \As Appropriate		
Master Teacher Evaluation	F 2 \Semester	1 \Annually	2 \Annually
University Coord. Evaluation	F 1 \Semester	1 \Annually	1 \Annually
Building Coord. Evaluation	F 2 \Semester	1 \Annually	2 \Annually
P-12 State Report Card	S 2 \Annually	2 \Annually	2 \Annually
PDS Perception Survey		1 \Semester	2 \Annually
Candidate Satisfaction Survey		2 \Annually	2 \Annually
Graduate Satisfaction Survey		2 \Annually	2 \Annually
Employment Rates			2 \Annually
Employer Satisfaction Survey		2 \Annually	2 \Annually
Master Teacher Selection		1 \Annually	2 \Annually
Professional Development Participation		1 \Annually	2 \Annually
PDSNI Meeting notes		1 \Annually	
PDS continuation		1 \Annually	
PDS Inquiry Year		1 \Annually*	2 \Annually*
PDS Review & Renewal Year		1 \Annually*	2 \Annually*
Regents' Annual Review		2 \Annually	1 \Annually
Program Folio Review			1 \Every 5 years
NCATE Accreditation		1 \Every 5 years	2 \Every 5 years
Program Enrollment Patterns		2 \Biennially	2 \Biennially

Key: C=educator preparation candidate; F=PDSNI faculty; S=P-12 students; 1=primary significance; 2=secondary significance; *=within the overall four year cycle, each PDS does a formal Inquiry in the third year of its cycle and a Review and Renewal Year in the fourth year of the cycle. Frequency indicates the timeframe of data collection.

Just as with the curriculum revisions, developing the assessment framework and procedures became a compelling and on-going faculty development activity. Many of the elements in the framework include procedures and instruments developed and refined within the PDSNI. The PDS Perception Survey, for example, was developed to gauge perceptions of the effectiveness of the PDSNI to improve educator preparation. Each semester since fall 1998 parallel versions of the survey have been administered to all candidates, faculty and administrators participating in PDS that semester. The surveys are collected anonymously, with return rates from each group exceeding 95% each semester. The survey data are compiled and analyzed by program, response group, and by student cohorts. The survey data sets accommodate examination within and across programs as well as within and across semesters. The survey data facilitate collective self-monitoring of the PDSNI, tracking the effects of both deliberate and environmental changes and helping clarify areas needing improvement.

At the end of the second full year of implementation, spring of 2000, each of the 28 PDSs undertook a self-evaluation using the NCATE Draft Standards to organize their documentation of activities, strategies and practices. Once compiled by the PDSNI evaluator these data served as the basis for an overall self-evaluation. This procedure allowed us to gauge progress in the initiative against a relatively constant set of benchmarks. It also accommodated a review of priorities against a broader national perspective on PDS work. This self-evaluation revealed, not surprisingly given our initial focus, considerable strength in the functional area of collaborative educator preparation. The preponderance of positive evidence related to this PDS function and its related standards. Just as defining and addressing professional development activities in our

PDS work followed from the educator preparation focus, so too in the self-evaluation did this functional area demonstrate the second strongest show of evidence. Mutual concern for student achievement and interest in shared inquiry emerge in the self-evaluation studies as the areas requiring more focus. With the introduction of the formal four year cycle that includes a formal year of Inquiry for each PDS and the full implementation of the Impacting Student Learning curriculum component the communities of inquiry and student achievement functions of PDS will be more deliberately and systematically addressed.

Over the past four years a number of performance assessment strategies related both to educator preparation students' achievement, and role enactment by master teachers, building coordinators and university faculty have been designed and implemented. All educator preparation student performance assessments--in courses, field experiences, and apprenticeship--are keyed to the ten INTASC standards. Each year a course audit is completed that reviews the extent to which all ten INTASC standards are being addressed in each program. Beginning in the fall of 2001 each educator preparation program included three or more Impacting Student Learning components (see Table III above) through which candidates' ability to positively influence P-12 student learning can be cultivated and documents. A comprehensive documentation system has been developed for tracking candidate progress and achievement. The system includes an electronic portfolio through which each candidate presents evidence of achievement in relation to each INTASC standard. The course/program performance assessment form records candidate achievement scores for the INTASC standards addressed in each course, and, where applicable, the candidate's scores on each completed Impacting

Student Learning (ISL) component. These data can be aggregated from student to course to cohort within a program (Early Childhood and Middle Grades) to program. These data are useful internally for advising candidates, program review and improvement as well as for documentation to external program and unit evaluators. The culminating semester's Apprenticeship evaluation instrument is similarly keyed to INTASC and ISL and can be aggregated with the course performance assessment data.

Parallel instruments for assessing the performances of master teachers, building coordinators, and university coordinators also have been developed. As appropriate, items on these instruments are keyed to the NBPTS core principles. These assessment instruments are completed by all participants each semester and submitted to the PDSNI director. These data figure into annual evaluation of university faculty. The data on master teachers and building coordinators are shared through the university coordinators with the building coordinators and master teachers for any appropriate performance improvements.

Elements in the assessment framework that emanate from entities external to the PDSNI include the Regents' annual review of constituent institutions against the USG guidelines for educator preparation, and the NCATE framework for unit accreditation. New federal requirements for annual reporting of institutions' graduates' performance on PRAXIS II are also included. As elements in a comprehensive framework these as well as the internally designed components afford PDSNI participants a continuous stream of data and documentation that reflects the inherent complexity of the PDSNI and that are used to inform its work.

Resources

From its inception the PDSNI was envisioned as a transformation by the chair and faculty of the Department of Teacher Development. A central element of supporting its design, then, was the reconfiguration and redirection of existing resources, including personnel, time, and internal budget allocations. Personnel and time reconfigurations were addressed in the preceding sections on structures and role changes. The budget allocation that had been used to compensate part-time university supervisors whose work encompassed periodic visits to student teachers was redirected to master teachers in the PDSs, in recognition of their revised and enhanced roles as performance evaluators of the apprentices and as seminar coordinators. While university faculty continued to be reimbursed for mileage related to school visits, total expenditures for this purpose was reduced, primarily due to the reduction in the number of sites to which they traveled. The reserved funds were redirected to support all PDSNI faculty travel to and participation in professional conferences. Similarly the school systems in which the PDSs are located provide resources to support substitute teachers for Building Coordinators' attendance at meetings and for PDS faculty conference attendance. They also have provided resources to enhance the professional libraries in each PDS and to offset the increased demand on materials and supplies in the PDSs that the regular presence of the educator preparation candidates engendered. These resource commitments have made it possible for additional schools to participate in the PDSNI.

From the beginning of planning for PDSNI the collaborating partners have been successful in securing external funding, initially to support the planning and design work; and subsequently to sustain the initiative. In early 1998 a challenge grant of $150,000

was awarded by the state P-16 Council to support PDSNI development and initial implementation. These funds, spread over a 2½ year period, supported payment of annual stipends to the individual PDS building coordinators (this role did not alleviate any of the teacher's regular professional contractual responsibilities), planning workshops and materials, evaluation design and development, conference presentations and travel, the PDSNI professional development agenda (e.g. workshop stipends, materials, supplies), and clerical support. As the grant funding period drew to a close the PDSNI director and university vice president for academic affairs were successful in securing an annual allocation of $40,000 from the Special Initiative Fund of the University System of Georgia for the PDSNI. These funds and continued support by the school systems have provided the resources needed to maintain the PDSNI through its first four years of full implementation. Even in times of tightened budgets creative redirection of resources (predicated, of course, on steadfast commitment to PDSN) can prevent diminishment or dissolution of the PDSNI.

PDSNI as Catalyst for Complementary Initiatives

As the PDSNI has evolved over the past four years, the commitment of the university, school systems, individual schools, and P-16 faculty to it has forged its sustainability. The extended and deepened participation of faculty, administrators and students from all participating institutions has catalyzed a myriad of complementary initiatives. Included among these are the Teacher Leadership projects represented most prominently by the revised PDS master teacher selection/review process, the Problem Based Learning (PBL) project, and the Middle Grades Summer (STEP) Academy; the Advanced Academy for Future Teachers project which is, in part, linking PDS and non-

PDS schools to cultivate interest in and preparation for teaching careers among academically promising high school students; the Impacting Student Learning project which brought faculty from across campus together with PDS master teachers and apprentices to design program components for documenting teachers' impact on student learning and achievement across subject areas and grade levels; the Induction of Beginning Teachers project through which a comprehensive model of support, assistance and professional development for first and second year teachers is being collaboratively designed and delivered by faculty and administrators from across the CSRA. PDS master teachers and graduates, now first and second year teachers, of the PDS initiative are key participants along with colleagues from across the region in this project.

These initiatives represent extensions of and complements to the PDSNI. They also, and more importantly, symbolize the deepened commitment to collaborative work that the PDSNI has forged among partners, both individual and institutional. Over the past four years, external funding exceeding $400,000 has been secured to develop these PDSNI related initiatives.

Insights and Lessons

By the conclusion of the fourth full year of work the CSRA P-16 Council's PDSNI had matured as a robust multi-faceted exemplar of teacher education transformation. The PDSNI exemplifies comprehensive rather than piecemeal reform, continually evolving through increasingly collaborative efforts. The explicit commitment of the chair and faculty in the Department of Teacher Development to cultivating the PDSN as the centerpiece of its program improvement efforts was pivotal to its progress and effectiveness. By initially focusing on improving teacher education the faculty along

with teachers and administrators in diverse P-12 schools found common ground. Their work together engendered risk taking, trust building, and collaborative action which in turn provided the foundation for addressing the other three goals of the initiative—enriched student learning and achievement, enhanced professional development, communities of inquiry. As the initiative matured the PDS teachers realized an increased sense of empowerment from their participation as true peers in program revisions, operational problem solving, agenda setting, developing instruments for documenting and assessing PDSNI activities, and participating in disseminating the work of the PDSNI. For faculty in the Teacher Development Department the PDSNI has become a venue through which they can coordinate their teaching, service and scholarly agendas. As they continue to meet a four-course teaching load per semester, such coordination is essential.

While the PDSNI agenda has always been comprehensive, it became evident early on that there would be variations in when and how the grade-alike clusters would enact individual components. As an example, the task of developing a systematic and multi-faceted master teacher selection process was taken up during the first year of PDSNI implementation by the middle school group; the elementary and secondary clusters developed and implemented their plans during the third year. Being attentive to and working within the emerging rhythms of the collaboration are essential to its vitality and legitimacy. Like a garden with varied plant-life, vigilant cultivation and tending needs to be balanced with more freewheeling periods of self-defining growth and root taking.

Institutional commitment and support are similarly critical to the resilience of the PDSNI. The school systems and individual PDSs have demonstrated an abiding and

deepening commitment over the first four years of the initiative. They have viewed participation as a route to improving the quality of beginning teachers they are likely to hire and as a compelling venue for professional development among experienced faculty members in the PDSs. On the latter point administrators and teachers have noted that just by being a PDS all faculty and staff, even if they are not directly working with educator preparation candidates, view themselves as role models. While opportunities to integrate PDS focused professional development have not been fully realized, each succeeding year of work in the network has moved in that direction; most often with the PDSN master teachers leading the way.

The endorsement and support—in terms of encouragement and acknowledgement of the work—of the PDSNI by the university is no less important to its viability. The importance of recognition of the PDSNI contributions to the institutional mission and of faculty work within it in relation to tenure and promotion cannot be overstated. To the extent that the university is tenuous in this regard the PDSNI is at risk.

While intra and inter institutional histories, cultures, and traditions often pose challenges to comprehensive, transformative change in education, external regulatory bodies are frequently cited as impediments to this process as well. In the case of the PDSNI revisions in the NCATE Unit Accreditation Standards, the formulation and dissemination of the NCATE PDS Standards, and the promulgation of the University System of Georgia Regents' Principles and Guidelines for Educator Preparation actually contributed to the PDSNI's developmental momentum. To the extent that the internal vision for PDSNI and external regulatory requirements aligned the latter could be (and were) referenced when intra-institutional challenges or resistance were mounted.

Leadership in PDSNI focused on cultivating a shared vision and shared responsibility for the collaboration. The initial focus on improving the teacher preparation programs through a collaborative process with P-12 educators as full partners required simultaneous risk taking and trust on the part of the Teacher Development faculty. The transformation of the master teacher role was pivotal to solidifying the trust and commitment of the P-12 partners to the collaboration.

In its essence and potential PDSNI is metaphorically more a community garden than an institution, structure or static edifice. It requires shared responsibility for its cultivation and nurturing, mutual tending to its seasonal rhythms and environmental stewardship, creative restraint. The metaphor also suggests the inherent fragility of the PDSNI. Inattention, neglect, and pollutants can all too quickly engender its demise.

Bibliography

Buchman, M. & Floden, R.E. (1992). Coherence, the Rebel Angel. Educational Researcher 21(9), 4-9.

Cooper, M. G. (1998). Building a collaborative that will last. Teaching and Change 6 (1), 64-78.

Cooper, M. G., Thornton, H. J., & Eisenman, J. G. (2001). Three years hence: The CSRA P-16 PDS Network initiative. Georgia P-16 in Action 3(1), 14-16.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.) (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for developing a profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Elmore, R., Peterson, P.L., & McCarthey, S. J. (1996). Restructuring in the classroom: Teaching, learning, & school organization. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. & Watson, N. (2000). School-based management: Reconceptualizing to improve learning outcomes. School Effectiveness and School Improvement 11(4), 453-473.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1995). Tomorrow's schools of education. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1992). Teacher development in professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform (pp. 105-123). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development.(1992). Council of Chief State School Officers: Interstate New Teacher Assessment & Support Consortium.

NCATE 2000 Unit Standards.

NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools—Draft 1997.

NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools—2001.

Perkins, D. (1998). What is understanding? In M.S. Wiske (Ed.), Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice. (pp. 39-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Perrone, V. (1998). Why do we need a pedagogy of understanding? In M.S. Wiske (Ed.), Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice. (pp. 13-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schön, D. A. (1991). The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. Educational Policy 7 (1), 5-23.

Thom, A. R. (1998). Professional development schools and the destabilization of faculty work. ERIC Document: ED 420297.

Thompson, S. (2001). Master teacher selection. Georgia P-16 in Action 3 (1), 6-7.

Wiske, M. S. (Ed.). (1998). Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

January 2003
Mary Gendernalik Cooper, Ph.D.
Visiting Professor, Center for Educational Leadership, Innovation & Policy
College of Education, San Diego State University
formerly, Chair of the Department of Teacher Development, Director of CSRA PDSNI &
Coordinator of CSRA P-16 Council, Augusta State University, Augusta, Georgia

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Central Savannah River Area P-16 Professional Development School Network: A Reflective Summary of Four Years of Collaboration	
Author(s): Mary Gendernalik Cooper, Ph.D.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Visiting Professor, Center for Ed. Leadership, Innovation, Policy
Organization/Address: San Diego State U., College of Ed. 5500 Campanile Dr. San Diego, Ca. 92182	Telephone: 619 594 1430 / 706 849 8683 FAX: 619 594 7082
	E-Mail Address: Coopermg@aol.com Date: 6 January '03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org